

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/762,197 | 01/20/2004 | John B. Langley | 012.P6002 | 2497 | |
| 43831 | 7590 12/09/2005 | | EXAM | INER | |
| BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP | | | PEZZLO | PEZZLO, JOHN | |
| 1700NW 1677 | TH PLACE | | | | |
| SUITE 240 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| BEAVERTON, OR 97006 | | | 2662 | | |

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | (| | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | 10/762,197 | LANGLEY ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| 71 MAN NO DATE (41: | John Pezzlo | 2662 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim (ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED | l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 No. | <u>ovember 2005</u> . | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37 and 54</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37 and 54</u> is/are rejected. | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37 and 54</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | г. | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 October 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| See the attached detailed Office action for a list | or the certified copies not receive | u. | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | _ | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 22 July 2005. | | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2 of the specification, line 11 states "06/119,225" should be corrected to read -- 60/119,225 ---.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: Use of the words "capable of" in lines 3 and 4 need to be removed. Since these words render the claim indefinite.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

Application/Control Number: 10/762,197 Page 3

Art Unit: 2662

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

I. Claims 2, 15, 24, 28, 30, 34, 36, and 54 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,122 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the instant application and the patent are directed to claims, which a first frequency transmitting a first PPM signal and a second frequency transmitting a second PPM signal and both signals are encoded. The instant application does not expressly disclose that the transmitted data is alternatively encoded. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art to alternatively transmit the encoded data between the two frequencies using the PPM. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the claims state to at least in part encode data in the first PPM and the second PPM, which would provide the data with more immunity to nose and interference.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Wrigley (US 3,626,379) discloses a universal data acquisition and control system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Pezzlo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C.

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Jefferson Building

2A15

500 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA, 22313.

John Pezzlo

7 December 2005

JOHN PEZZLO PRIMARY EXAMINER